

BW399  
K4R4

Keelings' Reply to  
"A Statement of Facts"  
1827

100  
HVS

# Wesley Memorial Library

Thursfield Smith Collection  
of  
Wesleyana



Atlanta, - Georgia

# A REPLY

TO THE

PAMPHLET

INTITULED "A STATEMENT OF FACTS, &c."

IN REFERENCE TO THE

INTRODUCTION OF AN ORGAN INTO BRUNSWICK CHAPEL,

AND THE DISSENSIONS

CONNECTED WITH THAT PROCEEDING.

---

BY ISAAC KEELING.

---

LEEDS:

PUBLISHED BY HENRY SPINK, 37, BRIGGATE; SOLD ALSO BY H. CULLINGWORTH,  
BRIDGE-END; J. HEATON, JUN., AND OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

—  
1827.

BW 399

KARA

H. CULLINGWORTH, PRINTER, LEEDS.

Wes. 1442

# A REPLY

TO THE

PAMPHLET INTITULED "A STATEMENT OF FACTS, &c."

---

GREAT personages have sometimes little whims; in indulging which they shew as little relish for contradiction as in their more grave and formidable follies. One of the amusements of the titled, the powerful, and the vain-glorious, is travelling in disguise. In some countries, at certain periods, this has been effected by the simple, straight-forward expedient of wearing a mask. In other cases the intention has been pursued under the concealment of some professional garb. In modern times the recreation has often been enjoyed by means of the easy, fashionable contrivance of being *incognito* under a *travelling name*. Of this last airy and convenient disguise there are examples in every grade; from the *aliases* in indictments at the Old Bailey, to such rare and celebrated instances as the romantic journey of Charles the First, when Prince of Wales, to the courts of France and Spain; the travels of the late Queen as Countess of Arli, and of Louis the Eighteenth as Count de Lisle; and, in literature, the letters of Junius, and, till lately, the novels of the Great Unknown.

For such concealments the motives may be either good, bad, or indifferent. To be at once near and invisible may be more than sword and shield to a marauder or a conspirator; it may be a grateful shade to modest merit; or a re-

freshing relaxation to weary grandeur, escaping for a season from the stiff and burdensome ceremonial of official dignity. The Caliph Haroun al Raschid adopted this method to ascertain how his subjects were governed by his officers and judges. Nero had recourse to it to diversify and extend his profligacy. Peter the Great travelled as a private man that he might acquire naval, commercial and political information, in order to the better administration and more certain improvement of his wide semi-barbarous empire.

But these *incognito* personages can seldom completely suppress the sensitive habits and acquired instincts of rank. Louis the Eighteenth, when escaping through revolutionary France, was in danger of discovering himself by his anxiety to take with him some articles of personal splendour, and by the exquisite fastidiousness of his appetite : and Peter the Great declared war against a certain government because he had not been treated with sufficient respect when travelling through its territory in disguise. And undoubtedly those inferior personages who assume a travelling name in order to be foolish or selfish with impunity are likely to be meanly vindictive when their wanton proceedings are openly thwarted and chastised ; especially if their mischief was connected with ulterior views of ambition. What can we expect to be more bitter and insolent than detected and disappointed cunning ?

Certain personages (whose assumption of legislative and judicial powers reminds one of the poet Savage, who styled himself Volunteer Laureat, and who was told that he might as reasonably entitle himself a Volunteer Lord or a Volunteer Baronet) have been amusing themselves and deluding the public under various *incognito appellations*. They made one little trip under the travelling name of a *Methodist of the Old School*. Finding themselves rather neglected under this quaint description, for a few short excursions by way of prelude and experiment they borrowed the style and title of the Editors of the Leeds Mercury. But in this disguise they behaved so ill as to incur just animadversion, and open resistance. It appears from their subsequent behaviour that they had hoped their prerogatives and dignities as Volunteer Sovereigns would have been respected even in their anonymous state, and that they would be allowed to combine the pretensions of ambition with the immunities of concealment. Forgetting, in their extreme sensitiveness, that it was chiefly in their *anonymous* or *incognito* character, as *paragraph-writers*, that they had received chastisement,—they set up an outcry as if their christian and surnames, their personal peculiarities and family secrets, had been exposed in print and blazoned with marks of infamy. Happening to be associated in their real character with a useful and respectable body of men, they sought to obtain



sympathy and protection in their distress, by representing the whole community as being indiscriminately attacked and reviled. For the double purpose of convenience and of vengeance, they changed their incognito; abandoned for a short season their personations of Mercury; and prepared for new vagaries by boldly displaying a personal name, which was to stand for at least half a dozen. They seem to have discovered or imagined that the advantages of being anonymous were scarcely equal to the conveniencies of borrowing an irresponsible *incognito*; a name under which much might be said without startling the public; and which, as it would unite the vague attributes of both somebody and nobody, was safer and better than no name at all.

Under this travelling name they had for sometime threatened to publish a book; which formidable proceeding of theirs was spoken of by an unfortunate wight as a *mountain advertised to be in labour*.

The mountain has laboured; but the issue of its portentous throes is not an *innocent mouse*, but an offensive harpy; more disagreeable from its foulness than dangerous from its talons; such a birth as one would rather keep at cleanly distance with a long pole than strangle with even a momentary gripe.

Stimulated by the rage of disappointment and by bitter hatred, this oracle of the party, the ominous book, indulges in reckless and unmeasured vituperation. Against the obtrusive bystander who dared to expose their foul play, and to smile at the parturient agony, the indignation was immense and inexpressible. There was, therefore, poured out against him a torrent of voluble abuse, with which he feels just as much hurt and disgraced as if he had been literally covered with dust and mire by some rude violence in the street. Yet it was evidently intended to inflict overwhelming vengeance, and to disable him from offering further molestation. But inconsiderate rage, through missing its aim, often hurts itself with its own blows, besides laying itself open to those of its antagonist. In their fury to exterminate it seems to have been forgotten that what is written cannot so safely be misrepresented as what is spoken. The intruder on their mischievous sport is blamed as having said "the Local Preachers are bad men," and these expressions, *which his letter does not contain*, are put by them between marks of quotation. Neither can it be proved that he has in other words represented any of them, except the paragraph-writers, as bad in any other sense than that, being members of a certain society they had not only broken and outraged its rules, but had set themselves violently to change or overturn its whole system, and had attempted this by means which closely resembled the subtle policy of the papal interdict.

The honourable post they have assigned the letter-writer amongst the society of Jesuits he can quietly take at the feet of the venerable Wesley; who because of his firmness and sagacity as the pastor of a numerous flock gathered out of the wilderness, his wise and vigilant discipline, and his apostolical opposition to antinomian errors, was sometimes ineffectually derided by the title of Pope John.

The imputation of having claimed infallibility is an egregious blunder. Infallibility is security from error; not permanence of duration or continuance of prosperity. But it seemed, no doubt, worth the risk, if, by such confusion of terms, the reader could only be put upon a wrong scent, and have his attention turned away from the convincing fitness of the maxim, "The thing that hath been is that which shall be, &c." when applied to the inglorious and disastrous history of separations from Wesleyan Methodism.

The self-righteousness, and proud, pharisaic self-estimation which are said to be indicated by the letter, blaze out in the pages of the pretended "statement." Read only page 3, "That spirituality in our congregational worship which has so long characterised the Methodists of Leeds, and which we believe to be so acceptable to Almighty God." And again in the next paragraph, "The Leeds Society has hitherto set a noble example to the whole connexion." The self-righteousness which despises others also flashes out scornfully in the letter of "A Methodist of the Old School," who denies that more than one of those Trustees who favoured the organ possesses characteristic piety. That I think well of the principles and discipline of the community to which I belong, and that I think hopefully of its future condition, is such a proof of self-estimation and self-righteousness, as, I trust, I shall still continue to exhibit. If, when I joined the Methodists in my youth, I had not been fully persuaded in my own mind that they were not only a people of God, but also the best people I could find; or if, I had since discovered any holier and more scriptural sect, without taking up the cross, and joining that purer community, I should have just cause to be ashamed. I should not, twenty-two years ago, have joined the Wesleyan Connexion if I could have found a better. Let those who are otherwise persuaded follow as freely their own convictions: but let not such a practical solecism be required, under pretended liberal views, as that after having deliberately joined a community, and having continued in it more than twenty years, one should still regard it without decided esteem or zealous preference. I am, nevertheless, convinced that the present uproar is primarily occasioned by a portion of our people thinking more highly of themselves than they ought to think.



By a species of ingenuity like that which was so abundant in the paragraph of September 29, the assertion of the letter-writer that those "who could wait made inquiry, and ascertained that the number of local-preachers who remained faithful was sufficient, &c." is strangely misapplied, as if it had referred to the appointments of that Sunday which intervened between the secession of certain local preachers and the publication of the letter; and, on the false hypothesis that the letter represented all the principal places as being actually supplied on that identical Sunday, a charge of falsehood is insinuated, while credit is insultingly taken for pretended forbearance. The inquiry was, in part, necessarily made *after that Sunday had passed*: for, to render the disingenuousness of the managers of the secession more consistent and entire, it was made a part of their tactics to omit any distinct notice to the superintendents, of the names and intentions of the dissentients. It is said to have been agreed that those only who could not otherwise satisfy their consciences, should individually give notice that they would not attend their appointments. A few did accordingly make their intentions known; but, in the majority of instances, the Superintendents were left to ascertain, *as they could*, what places were likely to be neglected. This policy aimed at the double purpose of annoying the superintendents, and increasing the apparent strength of the secession, by causing appointments to be neglected which, with candid and timely notice, could have been supplied. When, therefore, the author of the strictures asks, whether some places in the country were not neglected, he is leading his readers away from the true question, which is *not* the *actual supply* of one Sunday's appointments, but the *sufficiency* of the number of local preachers who remained faithful. Some appointments on *that Sunday were* neglected, *not* from a want of *preachers* to supply them, but from a want of candid notice that they would *need* supply. But, it was not of *vital* importance to ascertain this in every instance prior to September 30th, and, therefore, the principal places being provided for, the itinerant preachers *could wait*, and make inquiries to ascertain, what is now notoriously *not hyperbolical, but true*, that the number who remained faithful was sufficient to supply all the pulpits of both circuits in town and country.

The logic on which the author of the strictures animadverts in his next paragraph [p. 41 and 42] is *his own*. He found it convenient to misrepresent a considerable number of separate arguments, by assuming them to be *parts* of one consecutive argument. Relative to the organ, it was suggested in the letter, that it was not an *essential*; that, as a mere *circumstantial*, it was a proper subject for the concession of *liberty* to those who desired it; that, whether it was essential or circumstantial, *charity* had been forgotten or renounced by some of the dissentients. It was further suggested that the

organ was, in more senses than one, *an instrument*; and that probably the paragraph-writers had become willing to let it rest for a season, lest the disproportion between the instrument and the great work in which they were employing it should be too apparent; and lest it should seem to be not less valued as a means of discord than abhorred as an instrument of harmony. Another distinct suggestion was, that the organ was the stalking horse of a few, that some of those few were trained sportsmen, and that their aim was to destroy the mutual affections of the people and their ministers. The next sentence remarked upon the inconsistency of the seceders in silently allowing an organ in one place, and rising into fury against a similar instrument in another place; and shewed that this inconsistency was rendered more striking by the circumstance that the former place they were still expected to supply. That they *would* supply it after the inconsistency was pointed out I did not suppose. That they *were* expected to supply it, is not denied by the author of the strictures. With such a pleader, in such a cause, Rhetoric generally comes in when Logic fails. Accordingly he immediately travels out of the record; and, after asking whether his clients *did* supply the pulpit in question, and just after noticing the important difference between fact and supposition, *he supposes* that, "probably the writer could not allow so favourable "an opportunity to pass to vent his angry feelings, &c." The "angry feelings" were only in the imagination of the advocate and his clients. The purpose for which the opportunity *was* favourable was that of shewing that their consciences *could* get over the scruples about an organ; that, in one instance, they had evidently not regarded it as an *essential*; and that their own practice had put it out of their power to maintain the tone and attitude of high-principled and consistent assertors of the evil and vanity of organs.

While he further describes the supposed cause of the supposed angry feelings, and asks, in his convenient hyperbolical strain, "if the cases "are (for *difference is*) 'not wide as the poles asunder,'" between a chapel which is private property, and one which is conveyed to the Conference, and placed in the hands of Trustees,—the author of the strictures has, unawares, *proved* two important points which he was doubtless far from *intending* even to *suggest*; viz. that those who *approve* and those who *abhor* an organ can easily unite when the Conference is to be assailed; though the very point on which these allies differ should be the occasion of their common warfare: and, that nothing but the calumniated authority of the Conference prevents rich men doing what they please in the chapels which are supplied by Methodist preachers. The impropriety of refusing to preach the gospel in the presence of an organ was next shewn by the letter-writer in the forcible right

words of an eminent local preacher; but this, being incapable of justification or apology on the part of those who had already preached for years in the face of an organ, is judiciously passed over by their advocate in silence.

The next imputation against the letter-writer is that he has spoken of some of the seceders as factious and revolutionary. Let it be particularly observed, that a combination of persons who are actually in a state of open insurrection; who have done every thing in their power to cause the numerous congregations of two circuits, and some elsewhere, to be deprived of the preaching of the gospel; who are so unscrupulous in their own measures that they boldly impugn both their superiors and the law, despising \* “government,” and being “not afraid to speak evil of dignities;” and who, in furtherance of their extensive views, and in order to operate on a scale commensurate with the circulation of the Leeds Mercury, concocted a paragraph for that paper which their own bold advocate hesitates to defend,—are so sensitively tender about words, that they are not to be termed *the faction*. Be it also remembered that, though such persons should tell their partizans the time is come *to strike a great blow*, and though they should endeavour to govern by intimidation and terror, they are not to be reminded of *the reign of terror*. It will also henceforth be well understood that their ears are more delicate than their consciences;—for, while as leaders and local preachers they make the most violent and systematic efforts to *extend* their respective jurisdictions; while they employ the most unconstitutional means to *alter* the relation which the several *parts* of our connexion bear to each other and to the whole; and while, by extended combinations of local preachers, claiming powers and rights unknown in our rules and usages, they endeavour *to insert a wedge*, as between the strata of a rock, and to heave up the whole structure of Methodism from its base,—still they cannot endure to be told that their disorganizing proceedings indicate ulterior purposes.

Here, however, I beg leave to explain, *once for all*, that neither myself nor my brethren are insensible or regardless of the just distinction between ringleaders and their followers; between those who compose bulletins in their own convenient way, and those who, unsuspectingly, are roused and managed by inflammatory insinuations; between those who give counsel like Ahi-thophel, or insult like Shimei, and those who, like the two hundred men who went with Absalom out of Jerusalem, have gone in their simplicity. We believe that many who are involved in the secession, and some others who have acknowledged that they are entangled in the net, are well-meaning men,

\* “Government, &c.” this scriptural phraseology is not here applied in a political sense.

who looked chiefly at what they considered present grievances, and did not enter into the long views of those schemers who, by leaving them no time for calm reflection, and keeping them in a constant whirl of dizzy, stimulating hurry and agitation, have led them rapidly along, till they find themselves perplexed in an unknown region, in the company of guides who have misled them.

The letter-writer is sufficiently acquainted with the conduct of some of the heads of the party to affirm, that this is not the first instance of their attempting to snatch the reins from lawful authority, and to gain unwarrantable privileges by bold usurpation. Their preaching gratis, on which so much stress is laid by their advocate, can be no proof of their being incapable of faction; and, however invidiously it may be commented upon, the daily bread of the letter-writer, furnished to him as a minister of Jesus Christ, is a very lame proof that *they* are innocent of irregular ambition. On this subject, I beg leave to refer to the able and argumentative letter of the Rev. Thomas Galland, A. M., in which the superiority of the sagacious ex-local preacher to the Head of the Church and the Apostle of the Gentiles is sufficiently explained.

In exculpation of his clients (defend me from such a friend) the author of the strictures affirms that some of them have spent from a dozen to twenty years or more in *projecting schemes* to promote the interests of Methodism. What a precious proof is here that they were utterly incapable of faction! Allow them their *own* views of what *are* the real interests of Methodism, consider *what* views they have now practically betrayed under the animation and excitement of what appeared to them a great crisis, and then the assertion of their advocate, that *so long* they have been *schemers* and *projectors*, considering the quarter whence it comes, will appear not very dubious.

Their representative endeavours in his next paragraph [p. 44] to delude his readers into the notion that the letter-writer had spoken contemptuously of the abilities and respectability of the Leeds local preachers in general. The readers of his letter will, however, have observed that, while he has classed one with the most eminent, and mentioned a sufficient number as remaining faithful, he has not whispered a word of disparagement against the ability or general character of any of them: and he has now "the candour to admit the fact" that after the secession of *the hyperbolical seventy*, there remain two very able and respectable bodies of local preachers. He takes this opportunity to add, that some of the best friends he has in the world are local preachers; and that if his health and life be continued, to local preachers yet

unknown to him he will probably be indebted for much of those pleasures of intelligent society and liberal friendship, which are so needful to counter-balance the bereavements and vicissitudes of an itinerant ministry.

The author of the strictures next wanders in speculation concerning "the object proposed in publishing such a letter." If he had not possessed the conceit to think that he could "see further into a stone" than either his readers or mine, he might have seen, what he would rather put out of sight, that I undertook to *answer the paragraph* of September 29th; to shew that it had the specious advantage of being *ingenious* without the solid merit of being *ingenuous*; and that, after the discussion and confirmation of that proposition, there remained not a thread of the artful web that was not unravelled. It might also have been gathered, from the internal evidence of the letter itself, that the writer was one who cared little about an organ; but who,—having some anxiety for the preservation of order,—being without his consent involved in "the wind of this commotion" by the extent\* of the field of conflict occupied by the dissentients,—and perceiving that they had begun to employ the envenomed weapons of misrepresentation and calumny,—felt impelled by just indignation to interpose as a bystander, and to check foul play.

His object was not, and could not be, to answer the misrepresentations of the "statement;" for it was then unpublished; nor was it either needful or desirable, before that pamphlet appeared, to go into the organ-question in detail.

Only once, when he voted with hesitation in the District-meeting, had he found occasion or inclination to interfere in that business. Not feeling any zeal, nor having any strong opinion on either side, respecting the general expediency of organs, he was not when this business commenced, and is not now, a partizan either for or against organs. He cannot regard them in any other light than as mere circumstantialia; which should rather exercise the prudence, than stimulate the zeal of a Christian community. Consequently he avoided interfering, till, by the secession, the Leeds West Circuit was most unconstitutionally involved in the disputes of its neighbour, and till the opposition was carried on with such delusion and violence as threatened extensive mischief. He then thought, with the Athenians, that it was no time for an honest man to be neuter; and, having first counted the cost of ob-

\* More than half of the local preachers of the West Circuit, which had no dispute within its own limits, had refused to attend their appointments.



structing the career of violent men; and having considered that a good conscience is better than a whole skin, he dared openly to dissect the dressed-up communication to the Mercury.

But those who practise foul play, in any kind of conflict, will rarely take interference patiently. The writer was therefore not astonished to find terms applied to him in print which he will not transcribe: nor was he surprised to find the manner of his interposition objected to by some who admitted its substantial justice. It was not new to him to observe that some, who can both say and do severe things, dislike to see chastisement administered by any but themselves. It is perhaps, scarcely necessary to remark upon the perverse ingenuity which represented him as "unimpressed with the views" contained in his own printed sermon on the value of the soul," and unfeelingly consigning to the world, and to Satan, the very persons whom he had feelingly and strongly warned against the probable danger of some of them being absorbed by the world. Some would, apparently, have preferred the style of Eli's reproofs: The author of the strictures appears to consider it the duty of the letter-writer and his brethren to have caressed their warlike sheep when they presented the sword's point; and to have conciliated besiegers when they were storming the breach. He collects from the letter all the words which singly express any severity; finds that they amount but to five, and, after all, are neither indecorous nor inaccurate, for only the word faction is contested; he therefore insinuates (what he prudently forbears to assert) that those terms are used repeatedly.

This may be the proper place to repel the imputation, urged by the author of the strictures, and by another writer, that the letter contains "an uncalled for attack upon other denominations of Christians." Only two of the denominations could have the smallest pretext to complain. One of those two has *not* complained, and *could* not with decency, while its very name is a standing declaration of war; being a public accusation against the Wesleyans as a degenerate people. The other has been glad of the seeming opportunity to complain. But the members of that community have presumed somewhat too hastily that they had now got vantage ground. That they had done the letter-writer no personal wrong, is nothing to the purpose. He is a member of a community whose Fathers they revile. When did they cease to make war upon us from their press? When did they forgive us this provocation,—that we have never deemed it necessary to answer them? When did they intermit the sale of those calumnious publications, from which the young man who writes to me has learned to speak of foul and disgraceful defections? Where are the proofs of their forbearance? Perhaps we may

find them in the April number of their Magazine of *this year*; which revives a slander nearly thirty years old, against one of our deceased Fathers, who died at Leeds nine years ago; a slander brought forward on the credit of an accuser who has been long dead, and originally mentioned by that accuser on no other evidence than—*he was informed*. The Magazine of that forbearing and forgiving community does, in the year 1827, charge the late Rev. Wm. Bramwell, with having publicly and knowingly asserted what was false in 1798: and the passage is wound up with, “Oh! when will ministers strictly regard the truth.”

Three lines of the Letter to the Mercury, without bringing any accusation against them, merely remarked upon the oddity of their name, and the looseness of their union. They know that we call ourselves Wesleyan chiefly for distinction's sake; and that, when some distinction became necessary (not before) we chose rather to give honour to him who had begotten us *in the Lord*, than to call ourselves *old*. It appears from their private minutes, as well as from their publications four years ago, that *they* have not always been satisfied with their title, having *twice changed it*; and that they did not always judge that to claim kindred with a distinguished servant of Christ as a founder, would amount to a renunciation of Christ as their master and foundation. To make it quite clear that they are not wanting in reverence for their founder, we are told they cannot tell *who* was their founder. And it was surely “a gratuitous employment,” to inform us of the statistical fact, that the 11000 members of that community have 59 travelling preachers to maintain: according to which proportion, our two Leeds Circuits, which contain 5200 members, should employ and support 27 instead of 6 travelling preachers: and the Leeds District which, (bounded as it is by the York, Sheffield, Halifax, and Manchester Districts,) contains 13923 Wesleyans, and has but 25 travelling preachers, should have 74. The “member of that community” is so courteous as to give credit for being well acquainted with a multitude of scriptures that must prove the excellence of their ecclesiastical system, to one who, if he had such knowledge, would of course be self-condemned for not walking in their most excellent way. An indirect invitation is thus given to discuss and compare that system and ours. But that system fell long ago into the deep well of obscure controversy; and as soon as it can induce an imprudent neighbour to go down to taste the sweet waters, it will try to get out upon his shoulders, and leave him to drown.

Both the hostile pamphlets, while they boast an accurate knowledge of the Plan of pacification, betray great ignorance of its true history and character. The internal divisions, which it healed and united, were *not* between

the preachers as one party, and the people as the other; but between two great parties which almost equally divided the preachers amongst themselves, and occasioned correspondent differences in the societies under their care. The danger then to be provided for was, *not* lest the people should abandon the Conference, but lest the whole Connexion, preachers and people, should separate into two great parts: the one having its chapels shut during church-hours,—its members regularly attending the service of the church, and receiving the sacraments from the clergy alone,—and its ministers acting, wherever they could, in close connexion with serious clergymen;—the other avowing total dissent from the establishment, and assimilating its ecclesiastical system (with the exceptions of doctrine, itinerancy and class-meetings) to the Presbyterian model. On each side there were persons of great weight and influence, both in the Conference, and amongst the societies. For a time, the hardy talent and influential character of some of the senior preachers, assisted by a prevailing reverence for Mr. Wesley's recorded and cherished opinions, delayed the requisite harmonizing process, and kept the opposite parties together in their disagreement as by a compressing force. This interval of delay was perhaps necessary, in order that the more powerful and sagacious minds might at last approach the subject with that ripe consideration, which, on some points, can only result from the free and frequent communion and collision of such minds, under the stimulus of great public interests. At length it became evident that no authority could maintain the temporary truce of parties much longer; and that it must come to either peace or war, amalgamation or separation. A committee of nine preachers was chosen by ballot for the special purpose of devising some plan of general and lasting agreement. When chosen, the Committee was perceived to comprize a fair proportion of men of both the great parties.

This Committee of nine, thus virtually representing the great parties, proceeded to arrange a system of mutual sacrifices and compensations. After the Committee had agreed upon the chief parts of this Plan, the Conference made one alteration and some additions, and confirmed the whole as it stands recorded. The second part of the Plan, and some of the addenda, comprehended matters which, though of considerable moment, were, at that time, inferior in interest to the greater disputes about sacraments and church hours; but were added to render that agreement of parties a general settlement of whatever then seemed likely to disturb the Connexion. And whatever the Plan of pacification did not enact or change by express words, it left in the same state as before it existed. To talk of the spirit of that Plan as some have done, is to take for granted that it repealed *every thing* which preceded it; and to assume that there was neither spirit, letter nor practice

of preceding rules and usages going on unrepealed. The Plan of pacification was not a commencement, not a renovation, not a general repeal; but a great modification, effected by mutual concession and agreement. The characteristic discipline of Methodism was formed; and the great parts of its constitution, classes, leaders, stewards, trustees, local preachers, superintendents and their colleagues, quarterly and leaders' meetings, district meetings and conferences, had acquired strength, with proportionate stature and action, before that plan was meditated.

Several important privileges were then conceded to trustees, stewards, leaders and local preachers; and conceded with a kindness and cheerfulness which were gratefully acknowledged by the recorded testimony of Messrs. Mayer, Pine and Longridge, eminent laymen whose praise is in our churches. In consequence of these concessions, (more fully explained and confirmed by the Conferences of the two following years,) local preachers, leaders, and stewards, elect the itinerant preachers to their office; so far at least as that the Conference cannot appoint any individual as a regular minister, unless he has first been received by a meeting of local preachers as their associate, and been selected, from amongst the Local Preachers, by the vote of a Quarterly Meeting. The second part of the Plan was a calm and wise settlement of jurisdictions and forms of proceeding. The whole Plan harmonized and satisfied the great parties, and rendered the subsequent disturbances abortive. The concessions in the Plan of pacification were least beneficial to Trustees; who upon the whole have the fewest acknowledged rights, and have been most strictly restrained to those which they possess by the law of the land. A protection against being excluded from the society, except after proof of immorality or breach of rule before their own meeting, is the chief privilege conceded by that Plan to Trustees as individuals; and the right of bringing an accused preacher to trial, on certain specified grounds, is the chief privilege yielded to them collectively. Trustees are not admitted, as such, into the quarterly, leaders', or local preachers' meetings. The few rights they have, connected as they are with pecuniary cares and responsibilities unsweetened by any profit, should not lightly and rashly be narrowed and invaded by the encroachment of other parts of the methodist body. In reference to the introduction of an organ into any chapel settled on trustees, the laws and precedents which prescribe the mode of proceeding, have given the trustees no other parties to deal with but the District Meeting and the Conference.

With a morbid and erring acuteness,—excited by an excessive desire to extend a local jurisdiction, and to grasp at new powers, neither granted by

rule nor sanctioned by previous practice,—those who argue the case on the part of the Leaders, assume that their claims are *quite clear*, though they extract the pretended proof of right from a *contested* and, at best, *doubtful analogy*.

The Plan of pacification determines and ascertains *in what cases* the trustees of any chapel invested with pecuniary interests, which might suffer injury by rash change or interference; and the stewards and leaders belonging to the same chapel, *were acknowledged* by the Conference of 1795 as representatives; viz. they were thus recognised in applications to the Conference for permission to have the administration of baptism and the Lord's supper, burial of the dead, and service in church hours. It is stoutly assumed by the dissentients that the same parties have the same right to interfere concerning the adoption of liturgical services, which are afterwards mentioned in the Plan of pacification; and that organs belong to the same class (though not mentioned) as the Liturgy. Here are two assumptions, the one rising upon the shoulders of the other, and neither of them tenable. For the article which mentions the Liturgy, places it on a totally different footing from that on which sacraments and church-hours were put. The Plan of pacification was a system of reciprocal concessions: and it plainly stipulates that where the church party is made to give way so far as to admit of sacraments and church-hours, the other party, which gains the church-hours, shall give way so far as to admit of the church-service on sabbath-forenoons, or the abridgment, or at least the lessons appointed by the calendar. Here is not a business of representation, but of direction; a statement of the compensation and condition which is to accompany the grant to those who apply most regularly by their representatives. The Plan virtually says, Let the trustees, who have a reasonable right to declare whether they think the change will be safe or injurious to the interest of their chapel, and the stewards and leaders of the society belonging to the same chapel, ascertain and certify in all cases, where a strong wish for sacraments or church hours is expressed whether to grant them will divide the society; but, if they find the desire unanimous, let them understand that those privileges will be granted with these stipulations, that the Lord's supper shall be administered according to the form of the established church, with liberty to sing hymns and to use extemporary prayer;—and, that forenoon services in church hours shall be connected with either the liturgy, the abridgment, or at least the lessons, but we recommend the full service. These latter articles are not referred to majorities of leaders or trustees, as the other questions of hours and sacraments are; but are stated as the conditions on which their requests for church-hours and sacraments shall be granted. No part of the Plan of pacification has been so



much evaded in practice as this stipulation of conditions: and no party in the Connexion has had so much cause to complain as that which cherished Wesleyan views of the establishment and its liturgy.

Thus neither the letter nor the spirit of the Plan of pacification sanctions the confounding of the forenoon service with organs, or the classing of either of them with sacraments and church-hours, as things placed on one footing. That Plan intended to give the Church-Methodists a compensation in their own chapels, when the altered hours of worship should preclude their attendance as before at both church and chapel alternately. This is not mentioned with a view towards any local question concerning the liturgy; but only to keep those things distinct which the law has distinguished. To suppose that if an organ-question had then existed it *would have been* placed on the same footing as sacraments is an exceedingly gratuitous assumption: for the Conference has always legislated in an independent manner respecting singing and instruments; and has never authorised either trustees or leaders to interfere with the duty of the officiating preacher who has the control, under known rules, over congregational worship.

But the late proceedings against the organ-question, at Leeds were vitiated from the commencement, by unauthorised and unprecedented interference. If the first-link of a chain be hung upon what will not sustain its weight, a thousand additional links will not make it hang better. Such in fact is the state of the arguments and proceedings here against the organ. They began with usurpation and assumption, and have built every proceeding on something which was first taken for granted without proof. It has been a baseless series; like the Hindoo astronomy, which places the earth on the back of an elephant, the elephant on the back of a bull, the bull on the back of a tortoise, and the tortoise upon empty space. To make the affair resemble that fabulous foundation of the world as fully as might be, the opposition was commenced by exciting the local preachers to interfere, who had no claim to do so either by rule or precedent; and by comprehending in the same measure the local preachers of another circuit; whose right to interfere was, if possible, less than nothing, for the local preachers of the East Circuit had *no* right, and those of the West had still *less* right to control proceedings between the Trustees and the Conference! Many of the local preachers, when solicited to sanction the interference, reluctantly yielded to strong persuasions, with not the remotest suspicion that their signatures would be flung before the public. Having founded this interference on a shadowy claim that was equivalent to empty space, the opponents of the Trustees further intended to place the opposition of the leaders on the back of the opposition of

the local preachers, to put the rejection by the District-meeting on the back of the opposition of the leaders, and to saddle their victory over the Trustees on the back of the District-meeting's negative, like the globe of the Hindoos over the three quadrupeds. They began with claiming rights for leaders and local preachers which were not in their possession; and claiming them on grounds, not of rule or precedent, but of disputed analogy. In their reasonings about the claim, they beg the question at issue, by insisting that when the law speaks about sacraments it *must* include organs under the same regulation. It signifies little to them that the same law gives local preachers, as such, *no cognizance* in either case. Without submitting the unprecedented claim to any adjudication, or waiting to have the principles granted which they beg as the foundation of their claim,—they assume the principle of the claim, usurp possession of the right, and proceed to action as if all were regular, fair and uncontested. Their address to the leaders is declared unconstitutional by the Superintendent Preacher, and is not received; they cannot get it read, but some of them get it printed. The leaders then assume that, as they *have* a right to interfere concerning sacraments and church-hours, consequently they must have a right to prohibit organs. The law does not *say* that they have this right, but they contend it *must mean* so. There *is* no precedent to sanction their interpretation of the law, but they resolve to *make* one. The Trustees *dare not pretend* to have a negative on any proceedings of the leaders *respecting the society*; but the leaders are indignant that their right to put a negative on proceedings of the Trustees *respecting their chapel* should be *at all questioned*.

Thus the business proceeds till some of the opponents of the measure introduce into the Leeds Mercury of February 24th 1827, the following paragraph.

“ We understand that some of the Trustees and Seatholders wish to have  
“ an organ in the Methodist Chapel, Brunswick Street, but as the Leaders’  
“ Meeting, and nearly all the Preachers here, both itinerant and local, are  
“ opposed to it, the matter will probably be referred to the decision of Con-  
“ ference.”

“ FROM A CORRESPONDENT.”

In February, the case stood thus *prejudged* before the public.

In May, the members of the District assemble; having most of them certainly read the above paragraph in February, and approaching the question they had to consider, with inevitable prepossessions concerning its local cir-

cumstances. If the assumed right of the leaders to interfere had not been taken for granted and acted upon, the question would have been examined by the Leeds District Meeting as impartially, and on the same unincumbered grounds, as any former organ-question or any similar case elsewhere. But, under the actual circumstances, the opponents having gained by their own usurpation, an aid from popular sentiment; and the District-meeting being also divided by doubts, (respecting the legal mode of proceeding, and the right of different parties to make or to oppose an application for permission to erect an organ) under the influence of popular prejudgment, and of powerful advocates for the leaders amongst the members of the District, they *give the benefit of their doubt* to the leaders who begin a new precedent, *deny* that benefit to the Trustees who relied upon previous usage, and negative the organ. Before the sittings of the District were closed, one of its members pleaded to have the minute of rejection cancelled, and to substitute for it a simple reference of the whole case to the Conference. This was refused; but it was admitted that the Trustees had the right of appealing to the Conference against the decision of the District.

The Trustees did appeal, on the ground, that the District Meeting had mistaken the law; and that, by yielding to unauthorised interference, it had created a new precedent, which, if not cancelled, would rule future cases elsewhere. The Conference received the appeal; decided the doubt in opposition to the new precedent; and ordered the same District Committee, with that instruction concerning the *law*, to sit again, and report concerning the *fact*. The result is that (not reckoning the votes of 8 or 9 other Preachers, who sat with the Committee, and assisted in the deliberations,) the same District Committee which had before rejected the prayer of the Trustees, did then grant it by a large majority.

The pith of the subsequent dispute is reduced to this:—does the Conference, which is undoubtedly a supreme judicatory over several inferior courts, possess the general powers of a court of appeal; or is there any peculiarity in this case which precludes the right of the Trustees to appeal, and the right of the Conference to receive their appeal? That the Conference, ever since Districts were formed in 1791, has received, heard, and decided appeals from their decisions, on all kinds of causes which can come before them, is known to all who have the best means of observation. And, that it must be so, is evident from the very constitution of Districts; which are Committees appointed *by* the Conference from its own body, merely to take those parts of the original business of the Conference itself, which can be more conveniently done by localized Committees; to employ the assistance of many preachers

(who cannot be spared to attend the Conference,) in determining local matters of inferior moment; and, by an extensive and simultaneous division of labour, to prepare business for the Conference in two days, which could hardly be done by the Conference itself as one individual assembly in some weeks. The Conference cannot but be a court of appeal, because it is a court of revision; the minutes of District proceedings being recorded *for its use*, and submitted to its examination and censure; and its control being necessary to insure uniformity in their modes of proceeding and rules of adjudication. At the late Conference, while the Leeds District stood corrected for having admitted a new precedent in opposition to organs, another District stood also corrected for an unprecedented facility in permitting the provisional erection of an organ between the Session of that District and the Conference.

On the general nature of supreme and appellant jurisdiction, the following remarks of Dr. Paley are clear and convincing.

“ If several courts co-ordinate to and independent of each other, subsist together in a country, it seems necessary that the appeals from all of them should meet and terminate in the same judicature; in order that one supreme tribunal, by whose final sentence all others are bound and concluded, may superintend and preside over the rest. This constitution is necessary for two purposes:—to preserve an uniformity in the decisions of inferior courts, and to maintain to each the proper limits of its jurisdiction. Without a common superior, different courts might establish contradictory rules of adjudication,” [as lately, the Halifax and Leeds Districts on organ-questions] “ and the contradiction be final and without remedy; the same question might receive opposite determinations, according as it was brought before one court or another, and the determination in each be ultimate and irreversible. A common appellant jurisdiction, prevents or puts an end to this confusion. For when the judgments upon appeals are consistent, (which may be expected, whilst it is the same court which is at last resorted to) the different courts, from which the appeals are brought, will be reduced to a like consistency with one another.—Moreover, if questions arise between courts independent of each other,” [as for instance between the Trustees of a chapel, as one court of Methodism, and the Leaders’ Meeting of the same or a neighbouring chapel as another court] “ concerning the extent and boundaries of their respective jurisdiction, as each will be desirous of enlarging its own, an authority which both acknowledge can alone adjust the controversy. *Such a power, therefore, must reside somewhere*, lest the rights and repose of the country be distracted by

“ the endless opposition and mutual encroachments of its courts of justice.”  
*Moral and Political Philosophy, Book VI. Chap. 8.*

But, is there any peculiarity in this case which precludes the right of the Trustees to appeal, and the right of the Conference to receive their appeal? This question may be paired with another, viz. Is there any thing so peculiar in this case as to give the opponents an unassailable, indefeasible property in the advantage gained by their own wrong proceeding? For, had they not claimed and exercised an unprecedented and contested authority; and were they not still claiming to be judges of their own cause, there would have been no departure from the most ordinary course, and the present uproar would not have existed. But how can the right of appeal be cut off? The decision appealed against was *vitiating*,—by a mistake of the law,—by such public clamour and such statements in the newspapers as caused an inevitable bias in some of those who tried the case,—by a departure from all previous precedent,—and an intromission of unauthorised interference. These were grounds for a supreme court to order a new trial.

But does not the minute respecting organs prohibit any application to Conference if the District Committee withhold its sanction? No. It requires that the case come first before a District Meeting. It authorizes the District Committee to forward the business through one stage, by recommending the case to the Conference. It prohibits the District to go further in favour of an organ. But the Conference requires the District to record its proceedings and opinions. The Conference calls for the minutes of the District, and subjects its proceedings to such review and correction as their occasional irregularity may require. The Court of King's Bench lately declared that its right to remove causes to its own jurisdiction, by its writ of *certiorari*, extends to all cases capable of being tried in inferior or provincial courts, *except those concerning which the law declares in express words, that they shall not be so removed.* In order to give the opposition in this case the permanent and insurmountable advantage of its own usurpation, the law should have said, *If the District Meeting refuse its sanction, the Conference will receive no application on the subject.* The design of the rule was evidently to insure and compel an application in the first instance to the District Committee. But, when the District Meeting refused its sanction, it admitted the right of the Trustees to appeal against its decision; and the February paragraph anticipated a final reference to the Conference, because the District Committee, on account of the influence of the Leeds preachers and leaders, was expected to be hostile.



Subsequent to the decision of the appeal, proceedings of the most extraordinary character have been commenced and persisted in by the opponents of the Trustees. Some of the local preachers and leaders of the adjoining circuit of Leeds West have been induced to act as if they had no superintendent of their own ; and as if they had themselves a clear and undeniable jurisdiction over the Trustees and travelling preachers of Leeds East, and over the Conference itself. Combined efforts, in both Circuits, have been recklessly employed for purposes merely vindictive. The pretext of the disorder is a jealousy of authority, and a zeal for liberty : but the disturbers evidently wish to keep all the liberty to themselves. They frown upon the seat-holders for presuming that they had liberty to petition the Trustees. They deny the Trustees liberty to deliberate concerning the accommodation of their seat-holders. They endeavour to restrain the liberty of the Trustees to apply to the District Meeting. They deny the Trustees the liberty to seek redress by appealing to the Conference. They forbid the Conference to have liberty to hear the appeal of the Trustees. They forbid the District Meeting to have liberty to sit again and review its own proceedings, or to benefit by information from its superior court concerning the law of a case. They deny to the Conference liberty to be a supreme court over the co-ordinate jurisdictions of its thirty-seven districts ; and, in particular, they will not allow it liberty to set the Halifax and Leeds Districts right, when they have both decided wrong, in opposite ways, concerning causes of the same class. Nobody must have liberty to speak or hear, to appeal or decide, to vote or print or stir but themselves.

One of their number, by summoning unconstitutional, and irregular meetings of local preachers from both the Leeds Circuits, after repeated warnings of his error, had broken the following laws.

1. *From the Minutes of 1796.*

“ Question 29. What can be done to prevent unruly or unthinking men from disturbing our people ?

Answer. Let no man, nor number of men, in our Connexion, on any account or occasion, circulate letters, call meetings, do, or attempt to do any thing *new*, till it has been first appointed by the Conference.”

2. *From the explanation of the above Minute, in the address to the Societies, 1797.*

“ As the Leaders' Meeting is the proper meeting for the Society, and the Quarterly Meeting for the Circuit, we think that other formal meetings, in general, would be contrary to the Methodist economy, and very prejudicial in their consequences : But,

In order to be as tender as possible, consistently with what we believe to be essential to the welfare of our Societies, we allow, that other formal meetings may be held, if they first receive the approbation of the Superintendent, and the Leaders' or Quarterly Meeting; provided also, that the Superintendent, if he please, be present at every such meeting."

For having persisted in summoning meetings which are thus prohibited by rule,—meetings which he had no more right to summon than a member of either house of parliament has to issue writs, in his own name, and in contempt of the throne, requiring the Lords or Commons to reassemble during a prorogation,—meetings such as no government, whether civil or ecclesiastical, can permit without committing political suicide,—a Local Preacher was accused by one of his brethren before that Local Preachers' meeting to which he was responsible. The accused Local Preacher not only avowed the conduct with which he was charged, but gloried in it, declared he would do the same again whenever he thought proper, and contemptuously refused to make the slightest concession or submission. The "Statement" of his party admits that the Superintendent, after declaring it to be his duty to say, that the Local Preacher so offending was suspended for three months, offered, "to let the matter drop entirely, on condition, that the "suspended individual would then acknowledge himself to have acted wrong, "and promise not to offend in like manner again; and, if he would not do "so then, if, at the expiration of six weeks, after having had an opportunity "of maturely considering the matter, he would make such a confession, "that then the punishment inflicted should terminate."

Those who have complained of this sentence, appear to have forgotten or disregarded the legal practice that, when a prisoner at the bar pleads guilty, avowing his breach of the law, and proclaiming his readiness to repeat the same conduct, as there is no fact for the jury to try, the case does not go to the jury, but the sentence is declared by the court.

It is also pleaded, concerning the law of the case, that "no penalty is "attached to its non-observance," and that, "as in the laws of general "pacification, it is stated, that no local preacher shall be taken upon the plan, "without the consent of the body, it is a fair presumption that no local "preacher can be expelled, and consequently not suspended, without their "consent." That no printed rule affirms what is here presumed is tacitly acknowledged by pleading the presumption as an inference, That the presumption is *fair* cannot be made to appear. As to the penalty, it is well known that our rules do not pretend, (and if they did pretend it would be

inevitably without success) to apportion a specified punishment to every description of offence. The general penalties of Methodistical law are admonition, putting back upon trial, suspension and expulsion. Ecclesiastical jurisdictions take cognizance of many offences which civil and criminal judicatures cannot notice: for those minor morals, which the laws of the land, armed with the public force, could not regulate or enforce, without infinite litigation and intolerable restraints upon personal liberty, are matters of importance to a religious community united by voluntary ties.

The hopelessness of any attempt to appoint specific graduated penalties for all the kinds and degrees of offence that can occur within a religious community, is sufficiently demonstrated by the following quotations from Dr. Paley.

Concerning the laws of the land, he observes that they “permit, or, “which is the same thing, suffer to go unpunished, many crimes, because “they are incapable of being defined by any previous description. Of which “nature are luxury, prodigality, &c.” *Moral and Political Philosophy, Book I. Chap. 3.*

Concerning both the scriptures and human laws, he says, in his next Chapter, “Whoever expects to find in the scriptures a specific direction for “every moral doubt that arises, looks for more than he will meet with. “And to what a magnitude such a detail of particular precepts would have “enlarged the sacred volume, may be partly understood from the following “consideration:—The laws of this country, including the acts of the legislature, and the discussions of our supreme courts of justice, are not contained “in fewer than fifty folio volumes.” [Paley said this in 1785] “And yet it is “not once in ten attempts that you can find the case you look for in any “law-book whatever: to say nothing of those numerous points of conduct, “concerning which the law professes not to prescribe or determine any thing. “Had then the same particularity, which obtains in human laws so far as they “go, been attempted in the scriptures, throughout the whole extent of “morality, it is manifest they would have been by much too bulky to be “either read or circulated; or rather, as St. John says, ‘even the world “itself, could not contain the books that should be written.’ ”

On the same subject he remarks, in a note to his evidences of Christianity, “Some appear to require in a religious system, or in the books which “profess to deliver that system, minute directions for every case and occurrence that may arise.—Now, how prolix, and yet how incomplete and

“unavailing, such an attempt must have been, is proved by one notable example:—“The Hindoo and Mussulman religions are institutes of civil law, regulating the minutest questions, both of property and of all questions which come under the cognizance of the magistrate. And to what length details of this kind are necessarily carried, when once begun, may be understood from an anecdote of the Mussulman code, which we have received from the most respectable authority, that not less than *seventy-five thousand* traditional precepts have been promulgated.’” [Quoted by Paley from Hamilton’s translation of Hedaya.]

Great indignation was manifested by some, (who in the “Statement” are crowned with “everlasting honour”) that *one* should have been selected for punishment, when *many* had participated in his violation of rule. On this subject, the following remarks of Dr. Paley, in his Elements of Political Knowledge, Chap. IX. cast a strong light. “In crimes which are perpetrated by a multitude, or by a gang, it is proper to separate, in the punishment, the ringleader from his followers; the principal from his accomplices, and even the person who struck the blow, broke the lock, or first entered the house, from those who joined him in the felony; not so much on account of any distinction in the guilt of the offenders, as for the sake of casting an obstacle in the way of such confederacies, by rendering it difficult for the confederates to settle who shall begin the attack, or to find a man amongst their number willing to expose himself to greater danger than his associates.” There are terms in this passage, which, of course, do not apply to any of the seceders; but the *principle*, of *selecting some* out of many offenders, is sufficiently explained and defended. And, while upon this subject, (of disavowing an improper and irritating application of severe terms) the writer will take the opportunity to declare, that,—whatever offence may be taken at the free discussion of questioned jurisdictions, of unauthorised usurpations, or of the conduct of leading agitators,—he has ever regarded leaders and local preachers, as such, with proper sentiments of Christian respect and affection.

Misrepresentations and calumnious comments on another topic are contained in two parts of the “Statement.” A modification of the rules of the children’s fund, authorizing a provision for the support of the boys at Kingswood and Woodhouse Grove Schools, which had been suggested and recommended by the Circuit Stewards, in several respectable Districts, was (as the “Statement” says) objected to, at the Leeds Quarterly Meeting, in September, 1826, “on the ground that they had not been previously consulted. It was, however, ultimately agreed to, on the express condition that their senti-

“ments should be made known to Conference : I understand that a copy of  
 “the resolution was regularly sent ; but when enquiry was made last Quar-  
 “ter-day, whether the minute of the Quarterly Meeting had been read, the  
 “Superintendent stated, that he did not recollect that the matter had ever  
 “been brought before Conference.” In this statement there is a minute, but  
 most important omission : the little, significant word NOT is wanting. The  
 truth is that “a copy of the resolution was NOT *regularly* sent.” The mover  
 of the resolution furnished his copy ; but, in the plenitude of his own all-  
 sufficiency, deemed it quite unnecessary to have the communication authen-  
 ticated by the signatures of the Circuit Stewards, whom alone the Conference  
 can recognise as the official organs of a Quarterly Meeting : consequently,  
 the Superintendent did not present the imperfect document, and the Confer-  
 ence had no opportunity of either receiving or rejecting it. But, most un-  
 questionably, if regularly sent, it would have been openly read in the Con-  
 ference.

In its account of the long debate, connected with the subject of the  
 Childrens' Fund, which protracted the business of the Quarterly Meeting  
 “two hours beyond the ordinary time,” the “Statement” gives a cautious  
 and tender description of an act, by which the suspended local preacher, add-  
 ing flagrant aggravation to all his former contumacious offences, usurped the  
 office of the Superintendent, and put to the meeting a motion, which the Su-  
 perintendent, as Chairman, had declared illegal. What would be the results,  
 if a member of the legislature should thus take upon himself to put a motion,  
 in either house, which had been pronounced from the chair or the woolsack to  
 be unparliamentary ?

There is an imputation in the “Statement” against one of the preachers  
 of the Leeds East Circuit ; in which [p. 25] he is made to say “that for  
 “their having dared to intermeddle with a matter that did not belong to their  
 “jurisdiction, and to punish them for it, they (the preachers) would help  
 “forward the organ-business.” The foundation on which this charge rests  
 is *sheer invention*. Another imputation against the same minister is, that,  
 in saying the “Conference would not be hectored and bullied,” he was  
 “borrowing the language of Billingsgate.” I am, I confess, not sufficiently  
 acquainted with the vocabulary of that place, to speak with much critical  
 learning on such a subject ; but, if I am not much mistaken, the words com-  
 plained of rather describe the conduct of some inhabitants of that part of the  
 metropolis, than belong exclusively to their particular dialect. By the gra-  
 cious permission of his reviewer [Statement, p. 41] the letter-writer retains  
 his own inference, that no respectable Wesleyan minister would, in his senses,



have made such a declaration as that reported in the paragraph of September 29, without such accompanying statements and limitations as would preclude the appearance of gratuitous folly : he retains it with this additional advantage, that it is not denied that the minister in question did make those other material statements in limitation and explanation, which in the paragraph of September 29th were suppressed ; and with the further advantage that the author of the strictures refers to vague report, concerning that minister's conduct, in a neighbourhood where the issue of a separation has been eminently disastrous and mortifying to the leading innovators.

There are, in the Strictures, some important, silent admissions and feeble, hesitating denials. The hyperbolical exaggeration in the paragraph of September 29th is not denied ; but an ineffectual attempt is made to retort the charge. The general and important charge,—that much ingenious contrivance had been employed to render the paragraph stimulating and alarming by an overcharged expression of what had some truth in it, and a suppression of some material facts which would have rendered the inflammatory parts comparatively harmless,—is, in the style of a bold, prevaricating witness, dishonourably and meanly evaded by stating that something else was also suppressed which would have been inflammatory if published. The author of the strictures leaves his friends under the unanswered and unanswerable charge, that *those of them who wrote the paragraph*, employed much art and management to dress up such a representation, as would have just enough of truth in it to save their credit, and enough of exaggeration and suppression of material facts to deceive and alarm its readers. The fatal likeness, between the policy of the secession, and the papal interdict, is also silently passed over. He objects to the epithets, “ hot-headed ” and “ cold-hearted ; ” but leaves the justice of their application unrefuted. Those terms were applied in the letter *only* to those *scribblers*, whoever they were, who wrote the hostile paragraphs. If the author of the strictures wrote them, he should have exonerated his clients : if he did not, he should, as their friend, have forborn to suggest again the obvious reflection, that they must be hot-heads that shewed such a morbid ardour for bringing these disputes before the world, and that they must be cold hearts that did not care, and had no pity, on account of the indefinite and endless mischiefs that might be occasioned, or the injury that might be done to the souls of the weak and ignorant, by calumniating a body of more than a thousand ministers of the gospel, in the public papers.

LEEDS, October 19th, 1827.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

WE, the undersigned local preachers, resident in Leeds or its vicinity, being from principle attached to the existing constitution of Methodism; and approving of its discipline as administered by the Conference in general, and by the Superintendent preachers of the two Leeds Circuits in particular; beg leave to explain (through the medium of the pamphlet, which we understand it is your intention shortly to publish,) that though, by urgent solicitations, accompanied with the most pacific professions, we were induced to sign a communication, from the local preachers to the leaders' meeting of the Leeds East Circuit,—we totally disapprove of the subsequent proceedings of certain local preachers and class-leaders, in holding unconstitutional meetings, publishing palpable mistatements of facts, and endeavouring to excite uncontrollable disorder in the Methodist Societies.

We also think ourselves most justly entitled to complain, that, in contempt of the earnest remonstrances of some of us, the signatures we had given, with peaceful views, to a paper addressed to the Leaders' Meeting only, have been so published to the world as to involve us in a seeming connection with other proceedings and resolutions, against which we have *constantly protested*.

Under all the circumstances of the case, we feel ourselves in duty bound to declare our most serious disapprobation of the attempts which are still making to distract and convulse the society; and we hereby avow our determination to support our ministers in the exercise of their pastoral rights and duties.

We are,

Rev. and Dear Sir,

Respectfully and Affectionately Your's,

GEORGE SMITH,	JOHN SMITH,
ISAAC WOODCOCK,	JAMES RAY,
WILLIAM WHITELEY,	JAMES HARGRAVE.
HENRY SPINK,	

To the Rev. ISAAC KEELING.

N. B. The new Plans for both Circuits contain the names of 46 Local Preachers.

Note. Page 5, of the Reply, line 8. By the phrase, *irresponsible incognito*, is meant the name of one who has neither office nor membership to lose; and who *is not*, as his borrowers *are*, liable to be called to account for any thing he may say or do, before the proper tribunals of the Wesleyan Connexion.

P. S. While the last part of this pamphlet was under correction, the author learned, from an authentic source, that the 2nd Paragraph, in the 2nd page of the "statement," which represents Mr. Stanley as having introduced the organ-question into the Leaders' Meeting, is not only untrue, but admitted to be so, in the presence of the same Leaders' Meeting, by one of the leading opponents

---

H. Cullingworth, Printer, Leeds.